



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXVIII, 3.

WHOLE NO. 151.

I.—THE PLOT OF THE EPIDICUS.

The plot of the *Epidicus* has long been a puzzle to scholars. Joseph Scaliger, in 1558, was the first to note difficulties in the play and the problem was touched upon in 1913 by Friedrich Leo.¹ Between these two extremes lies the work of a long line of scholars, but the most important contributions have been made since the time of Ladewig (1841). All the more serious difficulties are probably known, but it is only within the last twenty-five years that solutions have been proposed which may be taken as the basis of a fresh examination of the whole problem. By criticizing and extending the work already accomplished and by bringing to bear upon it some new points of view it is now possible, in my opinion, to formulate a more acceptable result than has hitherto been attained.

The plot is so complicated that a careful outline is necessary. The exposition consists of three scenes (vv. 1–180) the first of which is a dialogue between *Epidicus* and *Thesprio*, slaves from an Athenian household. *Thesprio* has just returned with his young master *Stratippocles* from the army which has been besieging Thebes. At his departure from Athens *Stratippocles* had commissioned *Epidicus* to secure for him a certain *Acropolistis* with whom at the time he was in love. *Epidicus* had accomplished this by persuading the young man's father to buy the girl in the belief that she was his long lost daughter (87–90). But *Epidicus* now learns from *Thesprio* that the fickle youth has fallen in love with a Theban captive—

¹ *Gesch. der röm. Litt.*, p. 133. For Scaliger's remarks see p. 246, n. 2.

quot illic homo animos habet? he exclaims in dismay. But Thesprio has more unpleasant news: that Stratippocles has borrowed the money (40 minae) with which to purchase his new flame from a money-lender at Thebes who is following him to Athens to collect the debt and hand over the girl. Ut ego interii basilice! is the cry of Epidicus, who forecasts the damage to his skin when his old master Periphanes discovers the first trick.

In the second scene Stratippocles appears with his friend Chaeribulus at whose house he is stopping in order to keep out of his father's sight until he can complete the purchase of his latest sweetheart. Like most young men in the plays Chaeribulus is 'broke' and quite unable to provide his friend with the necessary money. And so perforce they fall back on the wily resourcefulness of Epidicus. At this point the slave, who has been eavesdropping in the conventional manner, steps forward and, after some reproaches to his master and the usual threats on the latter's part, promises to cheat Periphanes (a second time) out of enough money to purchase the captive girl, if Stratippocles will keep out of his father's sight. He hints that Acropolistis, the pseudo-daughter of Periphanes and former love of Stratippocles, can be disposed of to a certain Euboicus miles (153).

The third scene introduces Periphanes and his old friend Apocides. From the conversation of the old gentlemen we learn that Periphanes, whose wife is dead, contemplates marriage with a poor woman of good birth who had borne him a daughter—the very daughter whom he thinks he has purchased in the person of Acropolistis. Neither the mother nor the daughter are named at this point, but the old man is planning to marry off his son as soon as the latter returns, for he has heard that the youth in amorem haerere apud nescioquam fidicinam. At about this point the action begins.

Epidicus overhears the old man's intentions concerning his son and makes it the basis of his trickery. He advises Periphanes—after much apparent diffidence at his own presumption in giving such advice!—to marry off Stratippocles and (as a preliminary) to purchase the youth's fidicina and sell her out of the lover's reach before he returns from Thebes. This proposal jumps with the old man's humor, for he does

not know that his son is already in Athens and that he himself has already purchased and has in his house his son's (former) sweetheart Acropolistis. Epidicus suggests that the purchase will be a good investment since a *miles Rhodius* (300) is dead in love with the girl and will take her off the old man's hands at an advanced price. It is arranged that Periphanes, to avoid arousing his son's suspicions, shall keep in the background, and that Epidicus and Apocides (the latter to guarantee good faith) shall transact the bargain with the girl's master, the *leno*. Apocides accordingly departs for the forum, Periphanes goes into his house for the money, and Epidicus (306 ff.), who must of course produce some girl to play the part of the supposed sweetheart, states that he will hire a *fidicina* and coach her (*praemonstrabitur*) how to fool Apocides. Apparently, although this is not here stated, the girl is to submit to a sham purchase.

Thus Epidicus secures the money which he hands over at once to Stratippocles for the purchase of the Theban captive, with the characteristic trickster's remark, *Dum tibi ego placeam atque obsequar, meum tergum flocci facio!* He then professes to tell his plan to the young men, but it is safe to say that not even an intelligent audience, to say nothing of the rough crowd that viewed the plays in the second century before Christ, could understand this plan as it appears in our text (353-377). I shall return to this point later.

In the next scene (382 ff.) Apocides brings from the forum the supposed sweetheart whom he thinks he has bought, but who has in reality been hired by Epidicus. She is the third young woman in the play and we shall call her the hired *fidicina*, since no name is given to her in our manuscripts. Apocides had not seen the *leno* and (of course!) had not witnessed the transfer of any money, but he had heard Epidicus talk with the girl and he is full of compliments for the slave's cleverness (414 ff.) in making her believe herself hired to play at a sacrifice, not bought. The audience of course assumes in accordance with Epidicus's plan that she is acting in collusion with the trickster. It is therefore a good deal of a jolt when in the following scenes (475 ff.)—the beginning of the *dénouement*—both her words and actions absolutely contradict this assumption. The soldier appears with the intention of buying from

Periphanes the girl for whose favor he and Stratippocles had been rivals (really, of course, Acropolistis, the pseudo-daughter). When the hired *fidicina* is produced, whom the soldier indignantly rejects, she proves that she sincerely thought herself merely hired to play at a sacrifice for a senex whom she does not even know by name! The audience, therefore, must make a new assumption: that she too has been fooled by Epidicus.

But still more confusion is in store for Periphanes. No sooner has he driven away in a rage the hired *fidicina* than his own early flame Philippa arrives searching for her daughter (and his). In this scene (526 ff., the ἀναγνώρισις) and the following (570 ff.) we learn at last important facts of the old man's previous life—facts which belong to the preliminary history of the play: that he had loved Philippa in Epidaurus, that Telestis, their daughter whose name is now given, was born in Thebes, that he had never seen the girl since her early childhood, that Epidicus however had been in Thebes more recently, and that on Epidicus's authority he had learned that she was a captive and had, as he supposed, bought her. But when, to console the grief-stricken mother, he calls from the house this daughter (really pseudo-daughter Acropolistis) and when Philippa indignantly rejects her, his anger though pathetic is certainly comic (581 ff.):

Quid? ego lenocinium facio qui habeam alienas domi
Atque argentum egurgitem domo prosus? etc.

Acropolistis is amusingly impudent, but she makes a clean breast of everything and lays the blame where it belongs—on Epidicus. Thus the first trick—the trick which had been already accomplished when the play opened—is revealed.

Little more remains. The old men buy straps and set out to find Epidicus, but that worthy saves himself by 'recognizing' in his young master's latest love (the captive girl), Telestis, his old master's daughter—not a very valuable service since the discovery is inevitable. The ecstasy of Stratippocles is of course short-lived, and he says resignedly (652),

Perdidisti et repperisti me, soror,

to which the unfeeling slave rejoins

Stultus: tace.

Tibi quidem quod ames domi praestost—*fidicina*—opera mea,

a suggestion that the young man may transfer his affections back to Acropolistis!

The play ends with the pardon and manumission of Epidicus, both richly undeserved, and the result is well summed up in the line,

Hic is homost qui libertatem malitia invenit sua.

One who has had the patience to follow the preceding outline will realize the extremely involved nature of the plot. But the plot is not merely involved; it is full of difficulties and obscurities even for the most superficial reader. To these more or less obvious difficulties careful study has of course added many more which are not so obvious. I shall first attempt to state and, so far as possible, classify these difficulties.

The main problem will be simplified by eliminating in the first place a number of defects which may be regarded as of no importance. In v. 14 Thesprio is represented as returning home by way of the *portus*, but in vv. 217, 221—where, to be sure, Epidicus is lying—the soldiers including Stratippocles are returning by way of the *porta*. It is easy to alter the text of v. 14 (so Ussing, Goetz) and the conjecture is attractive because in v. 217, where only *portam* is possible, the manuscripts have both *portam* and *portum*. But the contradiction may be attributed with equal probability to Plautine carelessness¹ and the tendency of recent editors is to leave the text unchanged, cf. Leo, Goetz-Schoell, Lindsay, Goetz.

The passages alluding to the sums of money paid for the slave girls are not consistent (53 f., 122, 141–142, 252, 347, 366, 406 ff., 467, 646 f., 703). Two girls were purchased, Acropolistis and Telestis, and we should regard the inconsistency as of no importance² if vv. 363–370 did not indicate that the sums ought to agree.³ The price of Acropolistis is stated by Peri-

¹ Langrehr (Miscellanea philologa, 1876, p. 17) noted that in the Amph. Plautus makes Thebes a seaport! Langen (Plautin. Studien, 1886, p. 138) remarks that the Greek model may have had no specific word at this point.

² This is the general view, cf. Langrehr, op. cit., p. 16, Langen, op. cit., p. 139.

³ Ladewig (Zeitschr. f. die Alt., 1841, col. 1089) notes several of these discrepancies and cites Taubmann who believed that in v. 366 Epid. is

phanes (the highest authority!) as 30 minae (703) and Epidicus agrees, but at v. 366 her value is 50 minae. The Theban captive (Telestis) cost Stratippocles 40 minae (53 f.) together with interest at the rate of a nummus per diem per minam. The interest is later merely alluded to in general terms (252, 296, 306) or entirely forgotten (122, 141 f., 296 ad quadraginta, 646, 708), and Epidicus actually secures 50 minae (347, 467). But the arithmetic of Plautus is usually very bad.

At v. 107 Stratippocles has told Chaeribulus that the captiva (Telestis) is *genere prognatam bono*. Langrehr argued that since Stratippocles knew the girl to be of good birth, he must have known her to be his sister. Schredinger and Langen denied this (rightly), and in his later work Langrehr so far receded from his view as to say that at least the poet ought to tell us how Stratippocles got his knowledge of the girl's birth. On this we may remark that the youth may have known her good birth, her true name, and even her father's name without suspecting that she was related to him, since Periphanes had naturally concealed the whole affair from him, cf. 166 ff. The point is not a serious one in the Latin play, but the passage has some bearing on the nature of the Greek original (see p. 249).

Periphanes and Apocides do not seem to notice or even to be aware of the bustle caused by the return of the soldiers from Thebes (208 ff.). Langen¹ finds difficulty in this, since they know that Stratippocles is with the army. It is however an unimportant detail.

Langen¹ suspects *retractatio* in the long passage on woman's dress (225 ff.). *Retractatio* has not been proved, in my opinion, and at any rate the passage has no bearing on the difficulties of the plot.

Like every other play of Plautus the Epidicus is often repetitious and numerous passages have been suspected by various scholars on this account. The tendency of recent Plautine scholarship is to abandon such criticism. A good illustration of

merely boasting and that in vv. 364 ff. he plans to go to the leno and instruct him to say that *to-day* he has received 50 minae so that the sum will tally with that just given to Epid., if the old men question the leno.

¹ Plaut. Stud., p. 144.

the changed attitude may be found by comparing Goetz's *Ditto-graphien im Plautustexte* (1875) and the same scholar's major edition of the *Epidicus* (1878) with the minor edition of Goetz-Schoell (1895) and the second edition of the *Epidicus* (1902). After twenty-five years Goetz admits the genuineness of nearly all the passages which he formerly suspected. Leo (1895) and Lindsay (1905) also bracket very few passages.¹ The suspected passages which affect the plot will be considered at the proper places.

But there are serious difficulties. Among these I shall include some which, although unimportant in themselves, nevertheless may have some bearing on the more important.

When the play opens Periphanes has already been tricked by Epidicus into the purchase of Acropolistis (his son's amica) in the belief that she is his daughter. How was the old man persuaded that she was his daughter? This question is not answered by the expository portion of the play and remains unanswered until vv. 564-566 from which we learn that Epidicus had told Periphanes that his daughter had been captured and was in Athens, and vv. 635 ff., from which we assume that Epidicus had been in Thebes recently enough to be able to recognize Telestis.

Periphanes planned to marry Philippa (166 ff.), but there is no further reference to this important feature of the plot—not even when Philippa and Periphanes meet and recognize each other (526 ff.).² Before this scene we do not know that Periphanes had ever been in Thebes or Epidaurus, and the only information vouchsafed by the poet concerning the old man's past life is that he had a daughter by a poor woman of good birth and that he believes himself to have purchased that daughter through the agency of Epidicus.

¹ Goetz-Schoell mark as *retractatio* vv. 431-434, and as interpolated vv. 109-111, 353 (but cf. Leo's punctuation), 384 f. (in part), 419, 518-520. Goetz (1902) marks as *retract.* vv. 431-434, and as interpol. 353, 384 f. (in part), 419. Leo brackets 385, 393, 518-520. Lindsay brackets 384 f. (in part), 419.

² Ladewig first called attention to this omission (op. cit., col. 1086 f.), adding that the gifts taken to Telestis by Epidicus (639-640) were probably sent by Periphanes and that the slave's lie about her capture roused the old man's memories of Philippa. The verb *afferre* (639) lends some support to the first suggestion.

A marriage is being planned for Stratippocles in the early part of the play (190, 267, 283, 361), but there is no reference to it later,¹ indeed the only reference to the young man's future is Epidicus's hint (653) that he may console himself for the loss of Telestis by returning to Acropolistis, his discarded flame.

The allusions to the leno cause difficulties (274 f., 288 f., 294 f., 364-370, 410-421, 445-501). In accordance with the first three passages Apocides and Epidicus are to go to the leno and purchase the fidicina whom, as Epidicus falsely asserts, Stratippocles loves. The leno is apparently the same from whom Acropolistis had been purchased two days before, for this is implied by Epidicus (364-370) who intends to deceive him into making a statement to the old men (should they approach him after the transaction)² which will be taken by them as a guarantee that he has just received 50 minae for the fidicina, whereas he himself means the money which he received two days earlier for Acropolistis. But the plan, whatever its exact nature, was not carried out,³ for the accounts of Apocides (410-421) and of the fidicina (495-501, cf. 486-487) show that Apocides did not see⁴ the leno at all and there is no reference to an interrogation of him by anybody. Since Apocides went along with Epidicus when the money for the fidicina was carried to the leno (291 f., 295, 303-305, 374, 410-421), an important part of the slave's plan must have consisted in convincing Apocides that the money (which was really handed over to Stratippocles) had been paid to the leno, but we are not told how the deception of Apocides was accomplished. The senex was certainly hoodwinked in some way about the money, but the only part of the transaction that he reports concerns the hiring or, as he thinks, the purchase of the fidicina

¹ Langrehr first noted this and explained it as one of the results of *contaminatio* (op. cit., pp. 11, 16). See p. 249 below.

² This is R. Mueller's interpretation (De Plauti Epidico, 1865), and it seems to be the essential meaning of line 365, whether we retain the manuscript reading *si quod ad eum adveniam* (with Leo) or adopt Camerarius's *Siqui ad eum adveniant* (with Goetz-Schoell), for in either case the leno is to say (dicat) that he has received money, etc. The sums do not agree since the price of Acropolistis was thirty minae according to the best authority (703).

³ Ladewig first noted this, op. cit., col. 1087.

⁴ Langrehr, *Miscell. Philol.*, pp. 13-14.

(410-421). This difficulty naturally suggests those which concern the girl herself.

The *fidicina* is alluded to or actually appears (in vv. 287-305, 313-318, 364-376, 411-420, 495-516). Epidicus's plan is clear enough. The old men have heard that Stratippocles is in love with a *fidicina* (191), and Epidicus plans to hire a *fidicina* whom he will instruct beforehand how to deceive the old men by pretending that she has been bought (312-318, 371-376). The account of Apocides (411-420) is in harmony with this, i. e. if the *fidicina* has been coached beforehand by Epidicus, the old man's words merely indicate that she plays her part so well that he believes her a dupe of Epidicus. But the girl's own actions and words, when she appears (495 ff.), contradict the plan: she believes herself hired to play at a sacrifice¹ for an old man (500 f.), she has not even heard the name of Apocides (496), and she does not know that she is talking with the very Periphanes about whose son she has heard gossip (508). Far from playing the conspirator, as the plan demanded, she acts as though she herself were a dupe.² There is therefore either a change of plan, i. e. Epidicus had not coached but had deceived her, or else she suddenly decides to tell the truth when the words of the soldier show (475 ff.) that the jig is up.³ In neither case is there any hint of the change.

¹ Did Periphanes contemplate any sacrifice at all? At v. 314 Epid., debating what *fidicina* to show to Apocides, apparently refers to a sacrifice for which Periphanes had ordered him to hire a *fidicina* and he determines to palm this girl off on Apocides as the supposed *amica* of Stratippocles. If a real sacrifice was being arranged, then the girl was actually hired, as she says (500), and Apocides was witnessing a *bona fide* transaction (411 ff.), although he believed the girl a dupe. But at v. 416 both old men seem to take Epidicus's statement to the girl (that she was being hired) as a clever lie, and Epid. certainly gave a wrong reason for a sacrifice (for the son's safe return), since early in the day, cf. *mane* (314), the old men did not know that Stratippocles would return that day. Or do they regard only this *reason* as a lie? Langrehr meets the difficulty by regarding '*mane . . . sibi*' (314-316) as a quotation, i. e. Epid. quotes what he will say to Apocides. This would eliminate the sacrifice entirely. Dziatzko's view is preferable, see p. 249.

² Langrehr noted most of the difficulties, op. cit., pp. 11 ff. Cf. also Scaliger, note 5 below.

³ So Langen, who admits however that she ought to say something to indicate her change of heart just as Acropolistis makes a clean breast

The discrepancies connected with the rôle of the soldier were the chief cause of Ladewig's theory of *contaminatio*:¹ in v. 153 he is Euboicus miles, in v. 300 he is Rhodius. And there are other difficulties involving both the soldier and Acropolistis. How can Epidicus plan (153-155) that Stratippocles shall sell Acropolistis to a soldier when she is at the time regarded by Periphanes as his daughter² and had certainly been manumitted?³ How does the soldier know⁴ that she is in the house of Periphanes (438, 457), and if she had been his amica (457), why did Stratippocles (153 ff.) know nothing about him? The soldier disappears absolutely from the play without obtaining any satisfaction (492) and the only allusion to the fate of Acropolistis is the hint that Stratippocles may return to her (653). It has also been objected that Periphanes, for one who has just recovered a long lost daughter, pays Acropolistis scant attention.⁵

The foregoing outline shows that the Epidicus contains many serious difficulties, and there has been a general disposition to regard it as obscure and too brief for so complicated a plot and so many characters. Necessary parts of the preliminary history are omitted or referred to very late in the play, trickery is planned, at times obscurely, and then changed without warning or dropped entirely, plans for coming action are

of her guile (591 ff.) in a similar situation. He assumes a lacuna after v. 495 in which there was an aside by the girl: actum est, etc.

¹ Op. cit., col. 1089.

² Goetz (1878), pp. xxi-xxii, cites from a copy of Camerarius's Basel ed. of 1558 a note by Scaliger on v. 417, 'At quomodo potuit eam emere Apocides?' and on the lower margin, *Pessima olkovoula*. Nam aut virgo est aut fidicina conductitia quam adducit Apocides. Si virgo est, ut verisimile est, non emetur. Quomodo domo auferatur ut conductitia illi supponatur? Nam Epidicus abest. Si autem conductitia, quomodo emi potuit, cum ipsamet neget se eo die emi potuisse et quinquennio ante manumissam? O. Crusius discovered in a Paris manuscript another note on vv. 151 ff. in which Scaliger remarked the difficulty of getting rid of Acropolistis when Periphanes was treating her as his daughter, cf. Goetz, *ibid.* liv.

³ The only direct statement that she had been manumitted is gossip (507 f.), but since Periph. believed her to be his daughter, he must have manumitted her, cf. Scaliger, preceding note.

⁴ Langrehr, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

⁵ Langrehr, *Plautina*, 1886, p. 17. But cf. Rud. 1204 f.

not carried out, and the close of the play fails to satisfy the demands of the situation which has been created.

The mass of contradictions, inconsistencies, and improbabilities in the plays of Plautus may be attributed to several general causes: the methods of Plautus himself, who was in many matters very careless; the phenomena of *retractatio*, which is a convenient term for all the changes made by those who produced the plays, and especially by those who revived them in later generations;¹ the interpolations which crept into the text after the plays ceased to be acted, i. e. chiefly during the period of the empire;² and the accidents which befell the text in the process of its transmission. One who studies the difficulties must bear in mind all these possible causes with their variations, and it will simplify our examination of the Epidicus if we can exclude any of them. It may be said at once that interpolation in the sense referred to has had no appreciable effect upon the

¹ It is probable that every play underwent changes even at its first presentation, after it had left the hands of Plautus, and the changes during the poet's lifetime may have been considerable, although the great revival seems to have occurred about a generation after his death, cf. Cas. prolog. Since it is usually impossible to fix the date of alterations due to *retractatio*, it is better to include under the term all phenomena which can be assigned to revisers of the plays while they were living dramas, in distinction from those which are attributable to Plautus's original version or to the scholarly activity of later ages.

² In this general classification I am assuming that the Greek originals were as free from serious defects in art as one can reasonably expect of comedy. Professor Prescott has recently questioned the correctness of this assumption (Cl. Philol. XI, 1916, 125 ff.), reminding us—quite properly—that it is dangerous to assume that all the writers of the *véa* were as careful as Menander. But in his tendency to attribute clumsy composition, etc., to the Greek poets, Professor Prescott seems to me to go to the other extreme and assume a degree of deficiency on their part which is just as unlikely as the assumption which he combats. There can be no doubt, it seems to me, that Philemon, Diphilus, and the rest resembled Menander and Terence much more closely than they resembled Plautus. I am speaking of course in very general terms; the resemblance would be closer, for example, in plays in which stories of a serious type were presented (the originals of the Rudens or the Epid.), far less close in those of a farcical character (original of the Most.). But the question is too large for discussion here, especially since Professor Prescott has promised additional evidence in support of his view. The present article was complete in its main outlines before Professor Prescott's views appeared.

plot of the Epidicus. Of the methods of Plautus himself one which has been a fruitful cause of difficulties is *contaminatio*, the dovetailing of parts taken from two or more originals into one play. The defects of the Epidicus have been attributed, in part at least, to *contaminatio* by several scholars, but the play lacks two of the most striking features of a contaminated play—excessive length and traces of two plots. The Epidicus has 733 verses; no certainly contaminated play has much less than a thousand lines, e. g. the Andria and Adelphoe have 981 and 997 lines respectively, and each of the plays which best illustrate the process in Plautus, the Miles and the Poenulus, is nearly twice as long as the Epidicus. This point is of course not conclusive in itself, but when we add the fact that there are not clear evidences of two plots imperfectly joined in the Epidicus, the process of *contaminatio* becomes a very unlikely explanation of the difficulties of this play. As Langen¹ has pointed out, the two plots which the upholders of *contaminatio* find in this play are so well combined that it is impossible to separate them. In other words *contaminatio* must be demonstrated in Plautus by means of imperfect sutures in the plays themselves, since there is no Donatus, as in the case of Terence, to give us information which we could not reasonably infer from the text alone.

The defects of the Epidicus, therefore, if attributable to Plautus himself, must be due to some process different from *contaminatio*. But *contaminatio* is only one of the many methods employed by Plautus in dealing with his Greek originals, and in the Epidicus certain difficulties can be traced, thanks to the results of a brilliant article by Karl Dziatzko,² to the freedom with which Plautus treated the Greek original of the play.

Dziatzko, approaching the Epidicus from the point of view of one who was seeking analogies for an outline of Menander's Georgos, argued convincingly that Plautus has based his play

¹ Plaut. Stud., pp. 146–147. Langen remarks that in both the Miles and Poen. the two lines of trickery are directed towards the same object; in the Epid. towards different objects, and the first deception is already completed when the play opens.

² Der Inhalt des Georgos von Menander, Rhein. Mus. LIV (1899), 497 ff., *ibid.* LV (1900), 104 ff.

on a Greek model in which the complications ended in the marriage of a brother to his half-sister (ὁμοπατρία).¹ Such marriages although not common were countenanced by Greek law, but were regarded by the Romans as incest. Therefore Plautus could not present such a plot to his Roman audience and was forced to alter it in such a way that all reference to this kind of marriage was removed.

Dziatzko has thus supplied us with a motive which explains many of the peculiarities of the Epidicus, and he himself pointed out that on this hypothesis we understand why the preparations for Stratippocles's marriage come to naught. At v. 190 Periphanes is planning to marry off the youth just as soon as he returns. In the original at this point probably the bride's name, i. e. the name of the ὁμοπατρία occurred. The wedding is referred to at vv. 267, 283, 361—naturally in the Latin play without mentioning the bride's name. The proposed sacrifice of Periphanes (316, 415, 500) is probably a remnant of what was in the Greek one of the preparations for the wedding. Moreover Stratippocles is represented as very much in love with Telestis (54, 133, 148, 362 ff.)—a fact which would naturally precede a happy marriage—but Plautus breaks this off abruptly and lamely (652). If Periphanes had some other girl in mind for his son, the plan ought to be carried out, since the affair with Acropolistis was displeasing to him.

¹ For the Greek attitude towards such marriages, Dziatzko referred to H. Blümner, *Gr. Privatalt.*, 1882, pp. 260 ff., and Schoemann-Lipsius, *Gr. Alt.* I (1897), 375. Kretschmar (*De Menandri reliquiis nuper repertis*, 1906, pp. 16 f.) supplies a number of actual cases: Nepos, Cimon, I, 1-2, Habebat autem in matrimonio sororem germanam suam, nomine Elpinicen, non magis amore quam more ductus: namque Atheniensibus licet eodem patre natas uxores ducere.

Plutarch, Themistocles, 32, *Θυγατέρας δὲ πλείους ἔσχεν, ὧν Μνησιπτολέμαν μὲν ἐκ τῆς ἐπγαμηθείσης γενομένην Ἀρχέπτολις ὁ ἀδελφὸς οὐκ ὦν ὁμομήτριος ἔγημεν.*

Minucius Felix, Oct. 31, 3, ius est apud Persas misceri cum matribus, Aegyptiis et Atheniensibus cum sororibus legitima conubia. (This is not accurate. Minucius is attacking pagan customs.) Add Seneca, *Apocol.* 8, Athenis dimidium licet, Alexandriae totum. (Seneca is speaking of the supposed relations of Silanus with his sister.) Probably the sister marriages of the Ptolemies were an outgrowth in part of this custom, cf. e. g. Theoc. XVII, 130.

For the Roman attitude, cf. Marquardt, *Privatleben*, I, pp. 30 ff.

This hypothesis accounts also for the difficulties connected with the soldier and Acropolistis. In the Latin play there is a reference to the sale of Acropolistis to the soldier (153 ff., cf. 300 ff., where Periphanes is willing to sell his son's amica, although he does not yet know that he has already bought her, and 437 ff., where he tries to sell her to the soldier). If we assume that in the Greek play she was actually sold or, if manumitted, turned over to the soldier, we can understand the facts as given in the *Epidicus*, i. e. Plautus having dispensed with the marriage of Stratippocles to his half-sister wished to make some provision, however lame, for the youth and so reserved Acropolistis for him (653). This would explain the contradictions noted above between the plans concerning Acropolistis and the failure to carry them out. It would explain also, although this is not in itself a serious difficulty, why the soldier is left without satisfaction.

The missing details of the preliminary history were presented according to Dziatzko, in a monologue of the Greek play spoken by Periphanes just before v. 166. Plautus omitted this monologue because it was concerned chiefly with the proposed marriage of Stratippocles.

The Greek original was not, on Dziatzko's hypothesis, a mere comedy of intrigue; characterization was prominent, and Periphanes was the chief figure, cf. the traces left at 166 ff., 382 ff., 526 ff. He atoned for his former sins by marrying Philippa and by the marriage between his children. Plautus has diverted attention from the obscurities and inconsistencies resulting from his treatment of this original by inserting into the midst of the action the figure of *Epidicus*, through whose wit a solution of the conflicting interests is effected, cf. 732,

hic is homost qui libertatem malitia invenit sua—

a line which in the best manuscript is assigned to the poet. Remarking that the *Epidicus* is an excellent illustration of the independence which Plautus might exercise, if he chose, in the treatment of a Greek original Dziatzko suggests that the poet's liking for the play (*Bacch.* 214 f.) may have been due to his consciousness of this independence.

Dziatzko's theory is thus a thoroughgoing effort to attribute the difficulties of the play—apart from some minor accidents

to the text—to Plautus himself.¹ He has certainly given the right answer to some of the most important questions, but his sweeping assignment of all the difficulties to one general cause is not adequately supported and can be disproved, I believe, in important particulars. He has in fact confused two questions: (1) How far does the Epidicus represent its Greek original? and (2) Is the Epidicus in its present form Plautine? He has answered the first question in the main correctly, but in attempting to include in it an answer to the second he has not only gone too far but has failed to supply the sort of evidence that we need. Before we can say with any degree of confidence that the Epidicus in its present form is essentially Plautine we must determine the method of Plautus in dealing with motives and situations of the same type as those which appear in this play. But first let us indicate the points which Dziatzko's theory does not explain, criticizing at the same time some details of his work.

The lack of necessary information concerning the early life of Periphanes which seems such a serious defect in the exposition is due, according to Dziatzko, to the excision by Plautus of a monologue of the Greek play which was so full of references to the proposed marriage between Stratippocles and the *δροπατρία* that the Roman poet could not use it. But why could he not make use of those facts which we need to know—the visit of Periphanes to Epidaurus, the birth of Telestis in Thebes, etc.—without at the same time using the marriage motif? He has in fact given this information late in the play (540 ff., 554, 635 ff.) and we must conclude that he could have given it in the exposition,² the place where we expect to find it whether it is repeated late in the play or not.³

¹ Dziatzko rejects *contaminatio*, *retractatio*, and the theory, urged chiefly by Leo, that the Epid. once had a prologue.

² If vv. 87 ff. represent a corresponding passage at approximately the same point in the Greek play, Dziatzko's assumption that the requisite Vorgeschichte occurred in a monologue of Periphanes just before vv. 166 ff. is untenable, for vv. 87 ff. imply that at least part of the information (the story of Telestis's birth) has preceded. This part therefore could not have been *first* presented in a monologue which *followed* vv. 87 ff., see also pp. 256 ff.

³ I assume for the moment that Graeco-Roman technique required that such information should be given in the *expositio*, cf. Leo, Plaut.

Moreover Dziatzko's theory, although it accounts for the dropping of the plans for Stratippocles's marriage (including perhaps the lame conclusion of his fate)¹ and for the difficulties connected with the soldier and Acropolistis, does not account for the failure of Periphanes to marry Philippa and especially for the very obscure and inconsistent trickery of the play. These difficulties still remain unless we assume that Plautus wrote more briefly, more carelessly, more obscurely in this play than in any other. The question is not whether the play is sufficiently intelligible to satisfy the requirements of an audience seeking mere amusement, for the play could be acted and probably was once acted in essentially its present form, but whether its difficulties are such as Plautus himself would have permitted in one of his compositions. The standard to be applied is not that of the *νέα* nor, except indirectly, that of an audience or reader—even a Roman audience or reader—but the standard of Plautus himself. He learned his literary art chiefly from the *νέα* and he had to please a certain rude type of audience, but we must determine what his actual methods were from a study of all his own plays. If the *Epidicus* were unique in its content and motives, it would be difficult to apply this standard, but it is not unique. It has a number of typical features: the familiar love affair between a wild young man and a slave girl (here two girls), the father who has sinned in his youth and has an illegitimate daughter, the slave who cheats his old master out of money in order to aid the love of his young master, a leno, a soldier, and finally the familiar *ἀναγνώρισις* (here appearing in a double form).

For light upon the defects of the exposition one turns naturally to other plays which develop to an *ἀναγνώρισις*: *Captivi*,

Forsch.² 199 (on the *Epid.*), and in general Chapp. III-IV; Legrand, *Daos*, 490 ff. For the detailed support of this point so far as Plautus is concerned see pp. 254 ff.

¹ The futures of young men are summarily disposed of without marriage in the *Most.* (1164), *Adel.* 997, cf. *Phorm.* 1036-1046, but we expect some authoritative person and not a slave to say the final words. Similarly we should not find difficulty in the practical neglect of Acropolistis if she were not so intimately connected with Periphanes. *Philematium* in the *Most.* is absolutely dropped and *Anterastylis* in the *Poen.*, though recognized as freeborn, is left without a husband or a lover. But neither of these ladies plays quite the same rôle as Acropolistis and we miss at least some final words from Periphanes about her.

Casina, Cistellaria, Curculio, Menaechmi, Poenulus, Rudens, and Vidularia. Two of these, Cistellaria and Vidularia, on account of their fragmentary condition are of little service,¹ but an examination of the rest yields important results.

Leo has emphasized the fact that with two exceptions all these plays are provided with an expository prologue spoken by somebody not connected with the action, i. e. since there is always a previous history, Plautus and probably his originals think it necessary to place the situation clearly before the audience. Thus in six cases out of eight the chief means employed by Plautus is the expository prologue. Leo indeed pushes this point to its extreme logical conclusion and infers that the Curculio and the Epidicus, the two exceptions, once had prologues.² He admits that Terence uses no expository prologue for plays of this type and that the Curculio needs none, and he states the possibility that in these two plays Plautus may have wished the *ἀναγνώρισις* to come as a surprise. He prefers to assume the loss of prologues because of two important facts: the serious obscurities of the Epidicus in its present form, and the failure, in the Curculio, to mention Epidaurus as the scene of the play until v. 341.

Leo's theory must be admitted to be possible, but it is far from probable even in the case of the Curculio and still less probable for the Epidicus. The Curculio may be considered, as Leo saw, an anticipation of the Terentian method;³ the addition of a prologue would simply make clearer a play that is already clear. But no prologue can easily be conceived which would remove all the obscurities of the Epidicus. I shall return to the Curculio below. Meanwhile if we compare the exposition of the Epidicus with the expository portions, both prologue and early scenes, of the other plays of this group,

¹ It should be noted, however, that both these plays have prologues, and that the prologue of the Cist. (120-148, 149-202) provides a thorough exposition, although we cannot follow the development within the play. Selenium, the heroine, is much like Telestis: she is *pudica* (100), as all heroines of this type must be except so far as the lover is concerned, cf. Poen., Rud., Aul., Andr.; she is 'recognized', but not by a brother.

² So Legrand, Daos, 490 ff., 504.

³ The play would be an exception, on this hypothesis, to Leo's rule that when the scene is not Athens, the fact must be mentioned in a prologue, Plaut. Forsch.², 199 f.

the Epidicus proves to be obscure and therefore abnormal. A few words will suffice to show how Plautus usually deals with the kind of information which is lacking in the exposition of the Epidicus—the early history of heroines like Telestis.

In the Cistellaria the story of Selenium's birth, the same story as that of the birth of Telestis, is told in the leno's speech (123–148) and in that of Auxilium (156–196).¹ The same is true of Casina, the heroine of the Casina, cf. prolog. 39–46, 79–81. The ἀναγνώρισις of this play has been reduced to the lowest terms (1013–1014),² but the omission of details causes no obscurities. In the Poenulus the whole story of Anterastylis and Adelphasium, the two girls who are about to become meretrices, is told in the prologue vv. 59–122; cf. Rudens, prolog. 35 ff., for the early history of Palaestra.

Among the plays containing recognition scenes, therefore, the Curculio affords the best opportunity for comparison with the Epidicus, since both plays lack prologues. There is in the Curculio no preparation for the ἀναγνώρισις, although the exposition is clear in all other respects. If then we were to assume, against Leo, that this play never had a prologue, we should have, in the failure to prepare for the ἀναγνώρισις, the best analogy to the Epidicus. Nevertheless I cannot believe that the analogy would be cogent. The early history of Planesium is not an essential feature of the first 532 lines of the play, in which her soldier brother does not appear. In this part of the play the interest centers in Curculio and his wiles, and Curculio knows nothing about the secret of Planesium's birth. In the Epidicus on the other hand the trickster Epidicus is not only the one person who knows all those who take part in the ἀναγνώρισις, but he has made use of his knowledge to deceive his old master into the purchase of a girl whom he believes, because of this knowledge, to be his daughter (87 ff., 598 ff.). The trickster and his tricks, therefore, are in this play inextricably connected with the story of those who take part in the

¹ If vv. 125, 130–132 were added by *retractatores* in order that Auxilium's speech might be omitted (Leo, Lindsay), the resultant shortening would illustrate the process which may have caused many of the obscurities in the Epidicus—a willingness to dispense with all but the bare essentials.

² Cf. Leo, Plaut. Forsch.², 207 f., Röm. Litt., 127 f., Cantica, 104–106.

ἀναγνώρισις. Moreover Periphanes in the early part of the play knows where Philippa is and is planning to marry her (166 ff.), so that the possibility of an intention on the part of Plautus to present a surprise *ἀναγνώρισις*, like that in the *Curculio*, is precluded. Among the plays having *ἀναγνώρισις* the *Epidicus* is unique in this employment of the trickster's knowledge of the heroine's story as a basis for deception. The closest resemblance to this peculiarity occurs in the *Poenulus* (787 ff.), where Syncerastus, the slave of the leno, informs Milphio, the trickster, that the two supposed meretrices are in reality free-born girls (894 ff.) and suggests that Agorastocles, the lover, can make use of this knowledge to ruin the leno. Milphio accepts the suggestion and plans that Hanno shall personate the father of the girls, but it is unnecessary to complete the trick since Hanno proves in fact to be their father—unnecessary in any event since the leno is already in the power of Agorastocles.¹ Moreover the *Poenulus* has a prologue.

But although the *Epidicus* is unique in its inextricable combination of trickery with the preliminary history when that history concerns the heroine's birth, there are several plays in which the preliminary history, of a different type indeed, involves trickery. These plays resemble the *Epidicus* only in the point that deception of some kind has been accomplished before the play opens. It is possible therefore to determine Plautus's treatment of this element.

At the opening of the *Amphitruo* Jupiter and Mercury have assumed respectively the likenesses of *Amphitruo* and *Sosia*. Minute information on this point is given in the prologue, vv. 115-147, even to distinctive ornaments which shall be visible to the spectators only (142-145), so that they may not confuse the gods with the mortals! The lengthening of the night and the stealing of King Pterela's bowl, both of which are promi-

¹ Milphio differs from *Epidicus* in that he avails himself of information given by somebody else, but it is the same kind of information. The *Truculentus* also resembles the *Epid.* in one important point: the assumption until very late in the play (825) of a fact usually given in a prologue—that *Diniarchus* has wronged the daughter of *Callicles*. This omission produces obscurity at v. 771, etc. But the resemblance is due to accident for it is practically certain that the needed information has fallen out of the prologue, cf. the lacuna after v. 17. See Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*², p. 206.

nent features of the deception, are also carefully made known to the audience (prolog. 113 f., 138 f.). Moreover there are many resumptive references to all these features within the body of the play in order that the audience may by no possibility become confused, cf. 265-269 (Mercury has assumed the likeness of Sosia), 470 (Mercury will continue his deception), 497 (Mercury announces the entrance of the spurious Amphitruo in a scene which is in fact a sort of second prologue), 277-290 (the night is longer than usual), etc.

Similarly in the *Captivi*, *Miles*, *Rudens*, and *Menaechmi* parts of the deception have been accomplished or bases for deception exist before the play opens, and in every case the situation is carefully explained both in the prologue and within the body of the play.¹ The evidence is, therefore, that when a deception has been carried out before the play opens, Plautus avails himself of a prologue and even repeats essential points within the play proper. The *Epidicus* is in fact the only play of Plautus (lacking a prologue) in which such a deception is mentioned without elucidation.² Thus everything that we know about the manner of Plautus precludes the view that the meager reference at v. 87 f. to a trick already accomplished can be taken as an anticipation of the Terentian technique. If Plautus had wished for once to abandon his usual practice and dispense with a prologue, he would not have been satisfied with so brief a reference as that in the *Epidicus*. The conclusion is inevitable that Plautus himself included in the play an adequate exposition of this trick and that vv. 87-88 are a resumptive reference³ to that exposition, i. e. that the real

¹ Cf. *Capt.*, prolog. 35 ff. (man and master have exchanged clothes and names), cf. 223 ff., etc. *Miles*, prolog. 138 ff. (the secret passage has been constructed), cf. 181 f., 187 f., etc. At 145 ff. the fooling of Sceledrus is announced *before* any reason for it has arisen! *Rud.*, prolog. 43 ff. (the leno has tried to give Plesidippus the slip). *Menaech.*, prolog. 17 ff. (the resemblance of the twins which is the basis of the complications). *Cas.*, prolog. 50 ff. (plans of the opposing forces for winning Casina). The *Casina* is the play concerning whose revival the best evidence exists. If the revivalists altered the play, they have certainly avoided obscurities.

² In the *Phormio* of Terence the trick by which the marriage of Antipho is effected has been accomplished before the play opens, but Terence, as is well known, relies on his *expositio* to present all parts of the situation, cf. for this case vv. 124-136.

³ Cf. the references n. 1 (above). The *Miles* offers the best analogy. Everything necessary to understand the secret passageway and its use

exposition once preceded the remnant now existing. Analogy indicates that this exposition was contained in a prologue and this inference is supported by the fact that there is no suitable place for it within the first scene unless we assume that it was originally included in the monologue of Epidicus (81 ff.) and that vv. 87-88 are a later substitution or a 'cut' by *retractatores*, and so the only remnant of the Plautine version.

But if Dziatzko's hypothesis and the loss of a prologue or some other expository passage account for a number of the difficulties, several still remain to be explained, see p. 251 f. The first of these is the failure to state that Periphanes carried out his intention of marrying Philippa. This omission causes no obscurity, and when a plot has developed in such a way as to make a certain result a foregone conclusion, the result itself is often stated in summary fashion.¹ The development of the Epidicus brings both Philippa and her daughter into the house of Periphanes (601, 657), and we know the old man's intention (168-172). A few words would have sufficed to state the result, and it is not in accordance with ancient technique to omit these few words. It is impossible to say definitely whether Plautus himself neglected to add such a passage or whether it has been omitted by those who cut the play in later times, but the second hypothesis is much more probable since there is no analogy for such an omission in the case of a major character.²

The obscurities connected with the trickery constitute one of the most serious difficulties of the play. Excluding the first trick, which has already been discussed, the object and methods of the deception within the play are quite normal and it is possible to compare the Epidicus in these respects with several other plays. The trickster plans and carries out a scheme by which he secures money from his old master to aid his young

is carefully made known (prolog. vv. 136-153), so that later brief references are enough, e. g. *res palamst* (173), the gestures used with *hicine* (181), *transire huc* (182), cf. 187 f., 195, 199, 227, etc. The situations in the *Amph.* and the *Capt.* are so confusing and pervade the action so thoroughly that the resumptive references are more complete than *Epid.* 87 f.

¹ Cf. Aul. 793, Cas. 1012-1014, Curc. 728, Poen. 1278, etc.

² There is no case quite like that of Periphanes—a senex contemplating marriage with a woman whom he has wronged years before although such a marriage is presupposed in the *Cist.* (prolog. 177 ff.).

master's love affair. This type of deception is common enough, cf. *Bacchides*, *Persa*, *Pseudolus*, *Phormio*, etc. The methods also are common enough: lying and thieving—these go without saying—but especially the use of one person to represent another, the method of masquerading or personation. By lying *Epidicus* secures the money for the purchase, as *Periphanes* thinks, of the son's amica whom the old man intends to sell out of the son's reach. The slave must of course produce a girl to personate this supposed amica. For this purpose he secures the hired *fidicina*. In all this we do not demand that the object shall be a permanent or a worthy one nor even that the methods shall be very plausible. We are dealing with comedy, and we must not apply a high standard of probability to a form of art whose primary object was after all to raise a laugh. As a matter of fact the object of the deception in the *Epidicus* is wholly ephemeral, as is usual, and the old men are gullible enough. But we have a right to demand that the trick as a trick should be planned and executed clearly, else it fails in large measure to attain its humble object. If an audience does not fully understand a trick, the resultant laughter is not unmingled with bewilderment. Perspicuity, not probability, is the criterion. Did *Plautus* understand this? The only way to ascertain his convictions, as I have urged before, is to examine the plays.¹

The situation in the *Bacchides* closely resembles that in the *Epidicus*. *Mnesilochus*, like *Stratippocles*, returns from abroad during the course of the play and is assisted by his slave *Chrysalus* to secure money for the purchase of his amica, *Bacchis*. Moreover the money is secured from the young man's father by lying and by convincing him that the girl is the wife of a soldier, i. e. that she is what she is not, cf. the *fidicina* in the *Epidicus*. In fact the *senex* is fooled twice, for the son through mistaken jealousy of his friend *Pistoclerus* returns to his father the money which *Chrysalus*'s first effort, mere lying, has placed at his disposal. The second trick is then planned and carried out before the eyes of the audience, aided of course by the opportune arrival of the soldier (842). The gullible

¹ All the trickery in *Plautus* has a bearing of course, but an examination of the most closely analogous plays will suffice for my present purpose.

old man gives up 200 Philips to buy off the soldier (903) and another 200 which he is led to believe that his son has promised Bacchis (1059 ff.) before she leaves him. Thus there is a large amount of deception in the Bacchides but there is not one serious obscurity.¹

In the Persa the money with which Toxilus buys the freedom of his mistress from Dordalus, the leno, is obtained by simple theft. But the stolen money must be restored (324-327), and so Toxilus tells Dordalus that his master has just sent home a beautiful Persian captive and that she is for sale. Lucris, the daughter of Saturio, a parasite, is induced to play the rôle of the captive while Sagaristio, a friend of Toxilus, acts that of an attendant Persian selling agent. Dordalus falls into the trap and after he has paid over the purchase money, Saturio appears and hales him into court where of course the sale of a free girl is declared null and void. But since Dordalus has made the purchase *suo periculo* (524, 715), and since the Persian agent has departed to his ship (709 f.), he makes no attempt to recover his money.

The chief method of deception is here the same as in the Epidicus—personation; but it is planned and carried out with perfect clearness.² The audience is even told just how Saga-

¹ I cannot agree with Leo (Röm. Litt., 119 f.) that the Bacch. is a contaminated play. There are really only two deceptions: (1) the lie about the pirate ship, and (2) the deception by which Nicobulus is convinced that Bacchis is the soldier's wife. The second deception is used *twice*, but the deception itself is one and indivisible. The only difficulty that affects the trickery in the slightest degree is the one noted by Langen at v. 347: that Chrysalus informs Nicobulus where Mnesilochus is, although the success of the first trick depends upon keeping father and son apart until Chrysalus can forewarn the son (366 f.). But, omitting possible explanations, the difficulty is not serious, for the audience learns almost immediately (390 ff.) that Chrysalus has met the youth and put him on his guard.

² Some scholars have made a difficulty of the fact that Sagaristio attends the final banquet instead of going to Eretria (259). But he did not have to be in Eretria at once (cf. 260 die septumae), even if vv. 262 ff. do not explicitly state that he will not go at all.

The absence of Saturio and Lucris from the banquet has been attributed by Professor Prescott, with great probability, to the fact that being freeborn they cannot take part in such a slave celebration (Cl. Phil. XI, 128 f.). Besides they were forced into the trick by the power which Toxilus possessed over Saturio (140 ff.) and they require

ristio, the pseudo-Persian, instead of going to his ship, is to sneak per angiportum . . . per hortum (678 f.) into the house of Toxilus's master, and the girl is coached upon the stage, first in a scene which is practically a rehearsal (III, 1) and then at the crucial moment by asides from Toxilus and Sagaristio (IV, 4). There is a wealth of hints to the audience.

In the *Pseudolus* also the wiles of a slave provide the chief interest and the object is the same as in the *Epidicus*: to obtain money for the young master's love affair. *Pseudolus* guarantees to trick Ballio, the leno, out of the girl. As in the *Epidicus* a soldier is anxious to secure the same girl, and there is a second senex and a second adulescens. The first part of the play contains an immense amount of bragging threats and aimless assertion of resourcefulness on the part of the slave (120 ff., 232 ff., 382 ff.), but he himself characterizes them at their true value (394 ff.) and admits that he has not gutta certi consili. His dilemma is in fact worse than that of *Epidicus*, for his old master Simo has an inkling of the situation (408) and soon becomes fully enlightened (481 ff.). It is not until the entrance of Harpax, the soldier's messenger, at v. 595, that *Pseudolus* has any real basis for his wiles, and at once there is a clear statement that new plans are necessary and all previous ones abandoned (601-603).

The only important feature of the first 594 lines, so far as the real trickery is concerned, is the assurance given by *Pseudolus* to Simo that he will get the necessary money from Simo himself (507-518) and will cheat Ballio out of the girl (524-530), and the promise of Simo to supply the money if *Pseudolus* accomplishes both feats, i. e. the senex practically bets the slave that he cannot get the money from him or cheat the leno. The turn given to *Pseudolus*'s plans (if he had any!) by the arrival of Harpax renders it unnecessary to carry out his intention of securing the money from Simo, and in the end Simo pays his bet because the other part of *Pseudolus*'s task—the cheating of Ballio—has been so well done (1213, 1238, 1307 f.).¹ The

no reward other than the continuance of his favor. Like many other instruments of trickery in Plautus they disappear when their rôles are played, cf. *Simia* (*Pseud.*), the *sycophanta* (*Tri.*), etc., cf. Prescott, *ibid.*

¹ Leo finds a contradiction between *Pseudolus*'s promise (1) to get the money from Simo and to outwit the leno, and (2) Simo's offer of the

real plan required only five minae, the amount brought by Harpax to complete the payment for the soldier, and this sum is furnished by Charinus (734) with the assurance from Pseudolus that when Simo pays his bet, Pseudolus will pay back the loan. So when Pseudolus receives the 20 minae which he has won (1241), he has more than he needs to repay Charinus and is able to promise the return of *dimidium aut plus* to Simo (1328).

The real trickery therefore begins with the arrival of Harpax (595) and the first step is taken when Pseudolus, by claiming to be Ballio's servant, secures from Harpax the soldier's letter to Ballio. The method by which Ballio is outwitted is again, as in the *Persa* and the *Epidicus*, personation. A pseudo-Harpax is dressed up and sent to Ballio with the letter and five minae, and to him Ballio surrenders the girl. The entire transaction is clearly planned even to the dress which the false messenger is to wear (725-755), and as clearly executed (956-1051). The long scene between Ballio, Simo, and the real Harpax (1103-1237) merely clinches the result. We may remark in passing that although the soldier recovers his money (1230) he loses the girl, which is the same fate that the military gentlemen suffer in the *Epidicus*, *Bacchides*, and *Curculio*.

The illustrations given indicate how clearly Plautus presents many of the same types of deception which occur in the *Epidicus*. There is however one important feature which cannot be paralleled in the three plays just considered. It has been noted (pp. 244 ff.) that in accordance with the plans of *Epidicus* the hoodwinking of the *leno* (364-370) and of *Apocides*—so far as the false purchase of the *fidicina* is concerned—take place off the stage, and we have seen that the references to the actions do not agree with the plans. How does Plautus deal with this type of situation elsewhere? Light is thrown on this question by the *Asinaria* and the *Captivi*.

money if Pseudolus accomplishes *both* tasks by evening (Gött. gelehrt. Nachr., 1903, 250). But surely, since Pseudolus knows that money will be necessary in order to fool the *leno*, vv. 535-537 mean, 'Will you *give* me of your own free will' whatever money I may have to filch from you in order to cheat the *leno*? For the cheating of the *leno* is to *precede* (cf. 524). Pseudolus did not, of course, cheat Simo out of any money for the very good reason that the arrival of Harpax suggested an easier method.

In the *Asinaria* old Demaenetus is hand and glove with the two slaves, Libanus and Leonida, in cheating the Mercator out of the money necessary for young Argyrippus's love affair. The mercator is successfully convinced that the masquerading Leonida is the steward Saurea (II, 4), but he is so cautious that he refuses to pay over the money except in the presence of Demaenetus. Opportunely (!) Demaenetus is in the forum at the banker's (116, 126), and the final acts of the deception—the identification of Leonida as Saurea and the payment to him of the money—take place off the stage. These acts are clearly stated by Libanus (580–583) in perfect harmony with the other parts of the intrigue.

In the *Captivi*, Hegio is induced to believe that Philocrates is the slave Tyndarus, and he releases the pseudo-slave in the hope of recovering his own son. As in the *Asinaria*, the deception of the old man is presented on the stage, but the results—the release and sending away of Philocrates—occur off the stage and are clearly stated by Hegio (III, 2).¹

It is in fact the general practice of Plautus to be clear in his references to events that occur off the stage, cf. such narratives as Bromia's account of the birth of Hercules (*Amph.* V, 1), Curculio's tale of his deception of the soldier (*Curc.* 329–363), Strobilus's account of his theft of Euclio's money-pot (*Aul.* IV, 8), etc. Often indeed the poet goes so far as to present on the stage actions or parts of actions which have been announced to occur off the stage, e. g. *Mil.* 594 f., the senatus of the conspirators will take place *intus*, but (597 ff.) they come out and make their plan. Old Periplecomenus (*Mil.* 793 ff.) is to instruct the pseudo-wife and maid off the stage, but after he has brought them on, they are instructed all over again (874 ff.)! *Nequid peccetis paveo*, says Master Palaestrio, and this might be taken as the poet's motto in dealing with the spectators! Indeed the rights of the spectators in this matter are clearly recognized in the *Poenulus*. The *advocati* have been coached in their part off the stage and they are indignant that

¹ In the *Persa* the conviction of Dordalus is to occur off the stage before the praetor, cf. 741–752, and no statement is made later that it actually occurred. But the money (the essential thing) has already been secured and Dordalus, before his departure, laments its loss (742), so that his final conviction can safely be left to inference.

Agorastocles should wish them to rehearse,¹ but they recognize the rights of the spectators (550 ff.) :

Omnia istaec scimus iam nos, si hi spectatores sciant.
 Horunc hic nunc causa haec agitur spectatorum fabula :
 Hos te satius est docere ut, quando agas, quid agas sciant.

The last line states very well the attitude of Plautus himself.²

It is necessary to add a few words concerning the contaminated plays, for it may be argued that if Plautus allowed such glaring inconsistencies as we have in the *Miles* and the *Poenulus*, we need not worry about the difficulties of the *Epidicus*. The answer to this objection is that although these plays contain striking inconsistencies, yet they are not, like the *Epidicus*, obscure. I must content myself with one or two illustrations.

In the *Miles* (596) the audience is led to expect a plan to be made on the stage. Such a plan is actually made (765 ff.) and is later carried out. At vv. 612-615 a plan is to be adopted inside the house, but no word of its nature is told, and after the long autobiography of Periplecomenus the real plan is developed. All this is clumsy, but not obscure. Similarly in the *Epidicus*, if the plan to deceive the leno were merely alluded to and if no attempt were made to state it, there would be no obscurity. If, to take another example, we were told that the plan concerning the *fidicina* had been abandoned or changed, as we are told in the *Pseudolus* in a similar situation (601 f.), there would be no obscurity. Again in the *Poenulus* the accomplishment of the first trick puts the leno absolutely in the power of Agorastocles, and yet another trick is begun against him! But there is no obscurity about either one, and the audience would certainly have been as glad to see a leno twice 'done' as a Bowery audience would be to see a double penalty for the villain.

This study is by no means complete, but enough has been said to indicate that the *Epidicus* is in several respects ab-

¹ The rehearsal actually follows (III, 2) with all the conspirators present.

² The *retractatores* evidently cut all this unessential talk, cf. Leo, *adnot. crit.* on v. 503, who suggests that 543-546, 567-577 are a briefer version of the scene. This method of curtailing Plautine verbiage was probably applied to parts of the *Epidicus*, but the longer versions have not been preserved as in the *Poen*.

normal among the twenty plays; that a part of its peculiarities are probably due to the poet's treatment of an unusual Greek original, and others to the loss or intentional omission of a prologue or at least an expository passage early in the play, but that some difficulties, especially those connected with the trickery, should not be attributed to Plautus. These last difficulties were probably caused by those who cut the play during the period of its life upon the stage. In its present form the *Epidicus* is brief, complicated, and obscure, with an obvious tendency to present the bare essentials, particularly the comic parts, of the action. It is a sort of ancient 'movie' whose action touches only the high places, and this is a type of composition of which Plautus, with all his faults, is elsewhere not guilty.

ARTHUR LESLIE WHEELER.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.